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Abstract

Recently, a great number of studies have focused on researching the influence of branding strategies on viral advertising on social media platforms. However, to my knowledge, there are no studies on how viral marketing is affected, when using a controversial product that is advertised employing user-generated content.

The present research studies the effect of brand personality and advertising appeal, together with other independent variables, on attitude toward the ad and willingness to share a viral advertisement, using a controversial product like underwear. An online survey experiment is conducted to test the influence of two of the brand personality dimensions established by Aaker (1997), sophistication and ruggedness, for two different levels of advertising appeal, informational and emotional.

Unexpectedly, results revealed that there is no significant influence of brand personality and advertising appeal on attitude toward the ad. However, the present study found moderating effect of brand equity on the effect of brand personality on attitude toward the ad. Another interesting finding is that customer’s levels of self-disclosure directly affects their willingness to share the ad, when it comes to sharing content with a controversial product. Finally, this replicated previous findings, confirming the influence of attitude toward the brand on attitude toward the ad, which affects consumers’ willingness to share an ad. The effect replicated the results found by Mitchell’s (2000) as well as many others in the past, but within a novel context, thus, expanding the scope of generalization for previous findings. Several managerial and scientific implications are discussed, as well as direction for future research.
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1. **Introduction of research problem and statement**

Social media growth is undeniable. The number of active social media users grew 10% from 2015 to 2,307 billion users in 2016 (Index, 2016). New platforms, software, companies and consumers are being established in this rising market to enable interconnections between all of these organisms. The possibility of sharing information between each other promotes the propagation of word of mouth. Therefore, social marketers are progressively increasing the usage of this tool to create new marketing strategies such as viral marketing.

Social network spending trends indicated that the amount spent by worldwide marketers in 2016 worldwide would be 29,91 billion dollars, with an expected 35,98 billion dollars in 2017. This figure represents the 16% of worldwide digital ad spending (eMarketer, 2015).

Strategies to interact and engage with customers through social media are rising too. Past studies have proven the importance of the message, fresh and frequent content and incentives for consumer participation (Ling, 2005). As a result, many companies are calling users to share their content. Like in the present case study, other brands incentivise users to participate in campaigns by sharing pictures of themselves with the product.

In these cases, companies can achieve their advertising goals through viral marketing. Viral marketing consists of consumers becoming promoters of a product or service, consciously advertising it online to their friends or followers (Berger, 2014). However, does viral marketing still work when customers perceive the advertisements as provocative due to the controversial nature of the product? There are many factors that affect customer’s ad perception. In this case, we are going to analyse advertising appeal and brand personality.

Recent research into how top brands engage with consumers through social media, found that creative and provocative strategies are commonly associated with engagement, even though top companies are using functional appeals more frequently (Ashley, 2015). The sample of the study was based on top brands such as those used in this research. We will also consider, as a matter of study, the personality that a brand projects on their customers.
With brand personality being the set of human traits that are associated with a brand (Aaker, 1997).

Most of the time, social media advertisements make use of incentives or a concrete motivation to drive a consumer’s willingness to share (Berger, 2014). In the present case study, customers who share their own version of the ad on social media will hypothetically participate in a contest to win a voucher worth 500 euros. Lastly, a customer’s ad perception, and therefore their willingness to share, depends on the category of the product advertised. We are testing if users will be willing to share their own user-generated content, if the advertised product is considered to be controversial. Male/female underwear is classified by factor analysis as a controversial product within the gender/sex-related product category (Kim Shyan Fam, 2004). By making use of a controversial product like underwear for the advertisement within the viral marketing framework, this research will study the influence of brand personality and advertising appeal on the consumer’s ad perception, and further, on their willingness to share a picture of themselves with the product on social media.

2. Literature review

2.1. Advertising appeal
Aaker and Norris (1982) developed one of the first categorisation models for advertising appeals. This model differentiates two types of general advertising appeals, with one relying on feelings, images and emotions and the second using information, rationality and cognitive appeal (Aaker D. &., 1982). This model is also used and recognised as a marketing management tool by advertising agencies. An emotional ad is designed to appeal to the emotions of the customer, making use of emotion-eliciting strategies like mood, music, sex or comedy. In contrast, an informational ad is designed to recall the rational side of the customer by providing him with objective information about the product, its benefits and attributes (Yoo C. &., 2005).

Further research shows the effectiveness of this typology with regards to the product category. As mentioned in the introduction, recent research shows that functional appeals are the most commonly used by top brands on social media (Ashley, 2015). However, Johan and Sirgy (1991) proved that emotional appeals have higher effectiveness in value-expressive products,
while functional appeals have a stronger effect on utilitarian products (Johar, 1991). In this case, underwear is a product from the apparel category that can be seen as both value expressive and utilitarian depending on the consumer and the brand. However, in the context of social media viral advertising of controversial product (underwear in this case), functional appeal, which justifies passing information around, might be perceived as more appropriate context than emotional, which might create an impression of self-enhancing behaviour. Thus, **H1** is formulated as: For controversial products, informational advertising appeal would cause more positive attitude toward the ad, than sexual (emotional) advertising appeal.

### 2.2. Brand personality

Brand personality is the set of human characteristics associated with a brand (Aaker, 1997) In other words, the combination of personality traits that a brand projects on consumers. Aaker (1997) summarised human traits in a theoretical framework by defining five dimensions that represent the different personalities a brand can have: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. Past research proved that in many cases, consumers prefer brands that use appealing personalities to enhance and affirm their sense of self (Park Li Kyung, 2010). Therefore, this study will use two brands with completely different personalities that appeal to both the customer segment looking for products that make them feel sophisticated and one that prefers the feeling of ruggedness. The two brand personalities were chosen, because those are frequently encountered in the underwear market, examples of sophisticated brands could be Victoria’s Secret, example of rugged brand personality could be Nike (Park Li Kyung, 2010). It is reasonable to expect that in the context of ad, which is meant to be shared, consumers would perceive more favourably an ad, which is in line with the image that consumers want to present of themselves on social media. Men and women are likely to be willing to convey different images, perhaps somewhat in line with gender roles (Eagly, 1987), thus **H2** and **H3** are formulated as:

**H2:** For controversial products, women would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with sophisticated personality, than a brand with rugged personality.

**H3:** Gender would moderate the effect of brand personality on attitude towards the ad, so that men would have a more favourable attitude toward
the ad for a brand with rugged personality, than a brand with sophisticated personality, but the reverse would hold for women.

2.3. *Word of mouth (WoM)*

Word of mouth, as a concept, is defined as any exchange of information from person to person by oral communication. Intercommunication between consumers is a very important factor for business strategies. The importance of its influence is motivated by the variety of manners in which consumers can connect with one another. Moreover, near real-time communication methods have increased since the birth of social media, leading to a new level of WoM: electronic word of mouth (Blazevic, 2013).

2.4. *Social media*

Social media are online channels such as applications, platforms and media whose objective is to create or facilitate interactions between parties, by participating in a wide variety of activities like collaborative writing, content sharing, social networking and social bookmarking. As these platforms spread and become more important for entities like social networkers, business firms and governmental organisations, their shape evolved. They started appearing in many different forms: weblogs, social blogs, pictures, videos and ratings (Kim, 2012). Nowadays, companies make use of this channel by putting into practice all kinds of social media marketing activities including customer relationship management, customer service, consumer research, lead generation, sales promotion, branding and even paid advertising (Ashley, 2015).

In order to determine how companies can unlock social media’s full potential, numerous studies have been made to define which factors strengthen the effect of social media ads over their audiences. For instance, Ashley (2015) explained in her study that brand publications on social media are more likely to have an effect on customers if they are interactive and experiential (Ashley, 2015). Moreover, users of social networks such as Facebook use this platform to upload self-portrait images (Peluchette, 2009). Brands started combining these two concepts into a new social media marketing idea, asking consumers to participate in their campaigns by uploading photos of themselves with the product on their own social media channels. Advertising plus user-generated content (UGC) became the successful formula to result for viral marketing.
With the development of the World Wide Web into Web 2.0, online platforms and content were no longer created and controlled by individuals. Instead, they were collectively managed and modified by all users (e.g. blogs or wikis). UGC was possible even before Web 2.0, but this participatory way of content creation evolved together with the development of technological drivers (e.g. increase of hardware capacity), economic drivers (e.g. ease of tool availability) and social drivers (growth of a new generation with valuable technical knowledge and the willingness to engage online). This made UGC fundamental. Therefore, **user-generated content** is currently defined as the combination of all different ways in which users experience Social Media. It usually describes the elements of being distinct media content practices, publicly accessible and designed by end-users (Kaplan, 2010).

As Kaplan and Haenlein explained on their study in 2011, viral marketing already existed more than 10 years ago in literature papers. But after the rise of social media usage in the past years, the idea of viral marketing reached a whole new stage, becoming the electronic word-of-mouth. The online environment has enhanced the strength of viral marketing. Now consumers share content, experiences and opinions at much higher speed, often reaching larger audiences at once (Thackeray, 2008). **Viral marketing** is any type of marketing message that reaches wide scale diffusion. It can be related to a company, brand or product, however it always experiences an exponential growth when being transmitted (often through social media platforms) (A.M. Kaplan, 2011).

In order to get users to participate in social media viral advertising campaigns, as Ashley et al. (2015) found, most of the top brands will rely on contests more than discounts as a reward. However, it is important to research other variables as well in order to understand what drives a consumer’s willingness to share. A 2008 study of viral marketing by Arnaud De Bruyn and Gary L. Lilien shows how even though marketers can use incentives, design and other marketing tools in order to influence customer’s decision-making process there are some consumer-based attributes that cannot be controlled but need to be taken into account. This includes personal traits, preference and prior attitudes (Arnaud De Bruyna, 2008). For that reason, demographic features, self-disclosure, attitude towards the brand and social media account characteristics are also measured in this study. Lastly, recent findings indicate that in broadcasting, consumers are not as open to share pictures, as they are with narrowcasting. In the former, users will be more selective and only share
content that makes them feel good. Since we are studying a user’s willingness to share self-portraits with the product on social media, it is therefore important to promote a good-looking image of self in all four versions of the advertisement chosen for this study (Berger, 2014).

2.5. Brand equity and brand personality
Farquhar, P. H. defines brand equity as the "added value" perceived by a firm, a consumer or a trade that is automatically transferred to a product because of its brand (term, name, sign, symbol, etc.) The product offers a functional use or satisfaction, while the brand enhances its value by providing further connotations to it (Farquhar, 1989). This means that over time, customers see, learn, feel and hear about the brand. Based on those experiences they assemble an idea of the brand on their minds, which develops the brand’s power and builds up brand equity.

Brand personality is defined by Aaker (1991) as the combination of brand assets consisting in brand associations, brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality and many others (Aaker David, 1991). This is an abstract concept that can be seen from many different perspectives. As such, some detractors might argue about its deficiency, while others will make it work as a measurement tool by defining the distinct consumer behaviour effect over the enhancement of a firm’s marketing mix strategies. Finally, in a consumer-based approach, brand equity is the differential behaviour, perception and attitude that a consumer has for a branded product compared to an unbranded equivalent (Faircloth, 2001), the “added value”. This “added value” should be more important for brand with sophisticated personality, which are by definition the ones offering some “extras” relative to the brands with rugged personality, which are more focused on being functional and rough. Thus, H4 is formulated as: Brand personality moderates the effect of brand equity on attitude towards the ad: the effect of brand equity would be stronger for brands with sophisticated personality, than for brands with rugged personality.

This is important to establish because in order to build a strong brand, marketers need to ensure that their marketing efforts link the desired thoughts, feelings, images, perceptions and attitudes towards the brand into customer minds. Well-leveraged brand equity can have a positive effect on
many aspects that affect customer’s decision making. Some of these aspects include customer loyalty, less vulnerability towards competition, greater response to price increases or decreases and marketing communication effectiveness (Keller, 2001).

2.6. Attitude toward the brand (Ab)
Brand attitude or attitude toward the brand, usually confused with brand image, is defined as some of the associations that are used by consumers in order to create their particular vision of the brand’s image (Faircloth, 2001). Brand associations are any concept or idea linked with the brand in consumers’ minds. They are the overall combination of brand associations from the basis of their brand’s image perception, and therefore, evaluation (Aaker David, 1991).

Much research was made on brand equity and the factors that make this concept measurable. Aaker (1991) stated in his book that positive brand image and attitude should strengthen brand equity’s development. However, there were still scholars opposing it, arguing its lack of managerial usefulness (e.g., Ehrenberg 1997). Faircloth et al. (2001) put an end to those discussions by proving that specific brand associations or stimuli can be provided to the brand. This results in images and attributes that influence brand image, brand attitude, and finally, brand equity. In other words, marketers can manipulate brand equity by anticipating and creating the right associations in consumers’ minds (Faircloth, 2001).

Clearly, overall more positive perception of the brand should influence the perception of the ad, thus, H5: Attitude toward the brand would have a positive effect on the attitude toward the ad.

2.7. Attitude toward the ad (Aad)
Mackenzie et al. defined “attitude toward the ad” as the favourable or unfavourable predisposition for a customer to react to a particular advertising stimulus in a particular exposure situation (MacKenzie, 1986). Simultaneously, this positive or negative evaluation affects consumers’ attitude toward the object of advertisement and other parameters of advertising effectiveness, for instance brand preference (Gelb, 1983).
In 1981, Mitchell and Olson explored the idea that a consumers’ attitude towards an ad had an effect over the likelihood of a purchase decision. After considering the influence of Attitude toward the ad on their study, they obtained a better prediction of Attitude toward the brand and behavioural intentions. They not only found the influence of Aad on Ab, but also a further effect on brand choice and purchase intentions. In other words, using Pavlov’s classical conditioning theory about the linked behavioural response from one stimulus to another, Mitchell and Olson predicted that the positive or negative response towards an ad will the same response towards the branded product in the subject of the ad (Mitchell, 2000).

There are different models to study the interaction and influence of Aad and Ab. In this case, we are using the independent influences model where both variables have direct and separate influences on consumers’ will (MacKenzie, 1986).

What we are certain about, as was mentioned beforehand, is that ad appeal (emotional vs. informational) is recognised by advertising agencies as a useful tool for strategic advertising management. An emotional ad appeal is defined as the execution of an ad formed using emotion-eliciting strategies, for example drama, sex or music, known to attract consumer’s emotions. Instead, the execution of an informational ad is designed in an objective informational approach, describing brand attributes or product advantages, in order to attract the rationality of the receiver (Yoo C. &., 2005).

The level of involvement in product category and purchase decision also plays a very important role. Customers’ brand attitudes may be more affected by their overall attitude toward the ad than by attitudes and beliefs perceived from its communication (Yoo C. &., 2005).

2.8. Self-disclosure
The mentioned development of Web 2.0, viral marketing and social media platforms opened new possibilities for users to communicate and share personal information. Millions of users daily self-disclose personal and even intimate content on social media. Publicly sharing this information with large, diverse and often unknown audiences make us wonder where the limits between privacy and publicity are nowadays and which are the drivers for
people to publicly self-disclose personal information on social media (Bazarova, 2014).

Disclosure is firstly influenced by a complex consumer-based degree of openness-closeness. Moreover, the main driver for self-disclosure is the reward attained from creating social connections and promoting feelings of self-belonging. Social validation, relational progress, self-expression, identity collocation and social control are the five basic divisions on social rewards. However, implicit risks are also carried by public self-disclosure. Intimate levels of self-disclosure can lead to greater feelings of vulnerability and information loss, because some degree of privacy and personal control is lost when sharing information with others (Bazarova, 2014). Some people are more prone to self-disclosure than others, which should be reflected in willingness to share the viral ad, for sharing the ad is also a form of disclosure, which reveals individual’s preference. Thus, H6: Proneness to self-disclosure would have a positive effect on the willingness to share the ad.

Social media audiences include really close friends, as well as strangers and distant acquaintances that don’t have access to the user’s personal social circle and probably will never do. As Pierce and Sharp (1973) proved, users are more prone to self-disclose personal information or images with this type of public. On the other hand, when users can reach unknown acquaintances that face a great potential for future interaction or uninterested observers, their willingness to self-disclose personal information is very low, since its vulnerability and information loss levels are higher (Pearce, 1973). This is the main reason why it is considered important in this study, to gather information about the respondent’s social media characteristics and his/her perception of what their followers attitude would be towards the exposed commercial. Clearly, if the respondents expect the environment to react positively, they should be more likely to share the ad, as this action would be potentially more rewarding, but on top of that this expected opinion of others might reinforce or suppress one’s tendencies to share. This is a typical example of behaviour regulation in line with perceived social norms. Therefore, H7: The perceived attitude of friends/followers toward self-disclosure has a positive effect on willingness to share the ad and moderates the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad. The more positive f/f attitude toward self-disclosure is, the stronger the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad would be.
Before talking about self-disclosure we have to define what self-presentation is, since they need one another to coexist. Self-presentation is person’s desire to control the impressions that other individuals form of them, under social contexts (Goffman, 1959). This desire is driven by a person’s impulse of creating a positive response and a consistent image of their personal identity toward others. In other words, they want to present their online ideal self to the rest of the world. This exposure has taken place thanks to their level of self-disclosure, meaning that their willingness to reveal personal information is consistent with their desired self-image in a conscious or subconscious manner (Kaplan, 2010).

3. Research question and hypotheses

In order to quantitatively answer the stated research question, it is necessary to study the correlations between the variables just stated. In order to do this, the following research question has been formulated:

*Do brand personality and advertising appeal influence consumers’ attitude toward viral advertisement of underwear in social media? And if so, do they influence customers’ willingness to share the ad?*

Below is the summary of the hypotheses formulated based on the literature:

**H1:** For controversial products, informational advertising appeal would cause more positive attitude toward the ad, than sexual (emotional) advertising appeal.

**H2:** For controversial products, women would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with sophisticated personality, than a brand with rugged personality.

**H3:** Gender would moderate the effect of brand personality on attitude towards the ad, so that men would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with rugged personality, than a brand with sophisticated personality, but the reverse would hold for women.
**H4:** Brand personality moderates the effect of brand equity on attitude towards the ad: the effect of brand equity would be stronger for brands with sophisticated personality, than for brands with rugged personality.

**H5:** Attitude toward the brand would have a positive effect on the attitude toward the ad.

**H6:** Proneness to self-disclosure would have a positive effect on the willingness to share the ad.

**H7:** The perceived attitude of friends/followers toward self-disclosure has a positive effect on willingness to share the ad and moderates the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad. The more positive f/f attitude toward self-disclosure is, the stronger the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad would be.

Finally, of course, we expect that having positive attitude towards the ad would increase the willingness to share it, therefore:

**H8:** Consumer’s attitude toward the ad would have a positive effect on the willingness to share.

**Figure 1: Research model**
There are two dependent variables in this research model: consumer perception of the ad (measured as attitude towards the ad) and consumer willingness to share it. The independent variables, or object of manipulation, are two: brand personality and advertising appeal. Both of them have two levels of manipulation. Brand personality will study the two of the five brand personality dimensions of Aaker J. L. that fit the most with the advertised product (Aaker J. L., 1997). For example, the top underwear brand Victoria Secret represents sophistication, while the sporty brand Nike represents ruggedness (Park Li Kyung, 2010). On the other hand, regarding advertising appeal, informational and emotional appeal will be the two components that the advertisement makes reference to.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research design experiment
In order to test the present research hypothesis, a survey experiment is designed. There are two manipulated variables in this experiment: advertising appeal and brand personality. Each one has two levels (4 conditions), informational versus emotional appeal and sophistication versus ruggedness. The advertising appeal is manipulated through the picture’s appeal that represents the commercial, while the brand personality is manipulated by the brands chosen for the experiment: Victoria’s Secret and Nike (Park Li Kyung, 2010).

The experiment is designed as an online cross-sectional questionnaire, based on 2 different advertisements from 2 different brands. The commercials are modified to have a fewer differences between them (showing the same kind of picture, a group of people and similar underwear), which will make differences in treatment variables more noticeable. Thus, it is a 2x2 between-subject design, which means that respondents will be randomly assigned to one of the 4 different conditions.

After performing the survey-experiment, data is collected and introduced into the statistical software SPSS. The statistical tests will be performed using the software. Finally, findings will be interpreted, in order to find answers to our hypotheses. Further related findings from our study research will also be discussed.
4.2. Procedure
The survey is structured in 7 blocks and maintains the same format and order across versions (see Appendix). The first block presents an introductory paragraph that brings respondents into the topic and heads the advertising (only a few words change in every survey according to the specific condition and brand being tested on it).

Subjects who participated in the study received the following set of instructions:

“This survey is part of my Master thesis at the Erasmus University of Rotterdam. It is anonymous and all information provided will be used for scientific purposes only. It will take you about 8 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. Please read carefully the following case and answer the questions related to it (supposing there are stores of the publishing firm in your city).

Thank you very much for your time and support.”

The next block contains demographic and control questions to warm up respondents. Participants are asked 4 demographic questions about age, gender, religion and approximate weight (by asking the size of clothes with possibility to skip the question) followed by two control questions to determine if they have any social media accounts and how frequently they use it.

Below, the participant is exposed to the advertisement (representing one of the conditions). There are 4 different blocks and versions of the advertisement, one for each condition that this research paper is willing to study:

Victoria’s Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Victoria’s Secret sporty underwear on one of our social media channels. We believe in a fair game, so if you don’t own a pair of these amazingly comfortable underwear then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don’t worry, if you
still feel like passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on any of your social media channels. Don’t miss out on this special offer!

Nike is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Nike sexy underwear on one of our social media channels.

We believe in a fair game, so if you don’t own a pair of these amazingly appealing underwear then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don’t worry, if you still feel like passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on any of your social media channels. Don’t miss out on this special offer!
Immediately after the advertisement, the last block with the main questionnaire is presented.

To diminish the halo effect, brand equity questions are located earlier in the survey than the ones regarding brand attitude. In this way, there is no risk of distortion on respondents’ perception, since they will evaluate the detailed attributes of the brand before answering about the overall attitude towards the brand (Beckwith, 1975).

4.3. Scales
This survey was designed to ensure reliability and validity, since every concept is measured based on different existing scales gathered from previous research.

- Brand personality (manipulation check): Measured with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all descriptive, 5 = extremely descriptive). This scale consists of five items, the “Big Five” dimensions of Aaker (Aaker J. L., 1997). However, we will use only the two that are used in our study as a manipulation check: sophistication and ruggedness. Subjects are asked to rate to what extent the brand selected is defined by the two personality traits.

- Brand equity: Measured with a validated multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. The model is composed of three dimensions: brand
loyalty, perceived quality and brand awareness/associations, with two items for each concept. All of these items are evaluated with a 5-point Likert scale, going from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree (Yoo, 2001).

- **Attitude towards the brand:** Measured with three items on a 5-point semantic differential scale: very attractive/very unattractive; very desirable/very undesirable; and extremely likable/extremely unlikable. In this case, respondents need to answer only for the one brand assessed on their survey (Yoo, 2001).

- **Attitude towards the ad:** Measured with a 7-point semantic differential scale using two different items: like/dislike and interesting/boring (MacKenzie, 1986).

- Willingness to share: The willingness of every respondent to participate in the contest, share the ad and share information about the ad is measured as an intention question. The participant is asked to answer, “How likely would you be to...” in relation with 3 items: “…participate in the contest and post a picture of yourself in underwear?” “…share the advertisement on social media?” and “…share information about the advertisement with the person/people you communicate next with?” These three items are answered in a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = impossible to 7 = certain (Barasch, 2014).

- **Frequency of use:** Measured by one item, “Posting pictures of myself on social media is something I do...” along a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = never to 7 = always (Van Gool, 2015).

- **Self-disclosure proneness:** Measured with a 3-item scale, from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. There is one item regarding disclosure of facts: “I share/post pictures of my body on social media...”; and there are two items regarding disclosure of feelings: “I share/post my emotions on social media...” and “I share/post my thoughts on social media...”. The first item has been modified in order to be more specific with the topic. We ask about disclosure of self-body pictures, instead of asking for the disclosure of general facts (Laurenceau, 1998).

- **Friends or followers attitude towards respondent’s self-disclosure:** Measured with two items: “I think my friends/followers would not mind that I share pictures of myself on social media”, and “My friends/followers would approve
that I share pictures of myself on social media”. Both of them using a 7-point Likert scale with responses from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree (Van Gool, 2015).

5. Results and conclusions

After gathering the data we found that 154 questionnaires were filled in, but a high number of respondents left the survey unfinished. Thus, 53 questionnaires were excluded from the results. The sample size of this study was meant to be 120, in order to detect the true effect of the variables in this model. However, only a total of 101 surveys were completed. It is important to take this fact into account when considering the results of this study, since it lowers the statistical power of the research and it may be reflected on the significance of the results.

Hypothesis 1: For controversial products, informational advertising appeal would cause more positive attitude toward the ad, than sexual (emotional) advertising appeal.

Table 1: H1

ANOVA Summary table on attitude toward the ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising appeal</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>249.052</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,956,313</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this hypothesis a one-way ANOVA Between-Subjects test was run, with advertising appeal as independent variable and attitude toward the ad as the dependent variable.

As expected, the sample sizes are quite equal regarding advertising appeal, scoring informational (N=51) and emotional (N=50). Since the two levels of advertising type were randomly distributed within respondents on the questionnaire.

Table 1 shows that the overall model is not significant. The effect of advertising type on attitude towards the ad is not significant F (1,99) = 0.003,
p = 0.957. Therefore, hypothesis number 1 is not supported, having advertising appeal no relevant influence on the attitude toward the ad. The results after running the same analysis with the demographic variables as controls were non-significant too F (1,95) = 0.045, p = 0.832. Consequently, hypothesis 1 is not supported.

Lastly, I ran the univariate analysis of variance with our second dependent variable, willingness to share, instead of attitude toward the ad, for robustness. The effect of advertising appeal on WTS is also non-significant F (1,95) = 0.316, p = 0.575.

**Hypothesis 2:** For controversial products, women would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with sophisticated personality, than a brand with rugged personality.

Table 2: H2

ANOVA Summary table on attitude toward the ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand personality</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>246.244</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.956,313</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ANOVA Between-Subjects for Brand personality (IV) on attitude toward the ad (DV) showed that hypothesis 2 is not supported. The analysis was run with control variables, F (1,95) = 0.902, p = 0.345, and without them, as shown in table 2, F (1,99) = 1.132, p = 0.290. Consequently, there was no significant difference between the effects of a sophisticated brand personality or a rugged brand personality, on attitude toward the ad.

**Hypothesis 3:** Gender would moderate the effect of brand personality on attitude towards the ad, so that men would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with rugged personality, than a brand with sophisticated personality, but the reverse would hold for women.

Table 3: H3

ANOVA Summary table on attitude toward the ad
A new ANOVA was conducted to compare the main effects of brand personality (IV), gender and the interaction effect between gender and brand personality on attitude toward the ad (DV). As shown in table 3, both brand personality, $F(1,97) = 0.853, p = 0.358$, and gender, $F(1,97) = 0.041, p = 0.840$, are not significant and neither is the interaction effect does not exist in this model. Hypothesis number 3 is not supported.

**Hypothesis 4**: Brand personality moderates the effect of brand equity on attitude towards the ad: the effect of brand equity would be stronger for brands with sophisticated personality, than for brands with rugged personality.

**Table 4: H4**

Regression summary table on attitude toward the ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand personality</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>-1.071</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand equity</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effect</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to measure the interaction effect of brand equity and brand personality a regression analysis was run to study the main effects of brand personality (IV), brand equity (IV) and the interaction effect between them on attitude toward the ad (DV). Table 4 presents the results of this analysis, brand equity having significant positive effect on attitude towards the ad, $b = 0.313, t = 2.742, p < 0.05$, which is a very intuitive fact. The interaction effect is also significant, $b = 0.482, t = 2.344, p < 0.05$. Positive moderating effect shows that brand personality (coded as 0 for rugged and 1 for sophisticated brand personality) indeed moderates the importance of brand equity on the attitude towards the ad: the effect of brand equity on attitude towards the ad is stronger for brands with sophisticated personality than for brands with...
rugged personality. Lastly, none of the demographic variables were significant in this model, as shown in table 4.

**Hypothesis 5:** Attitude toward the brand would have a positive effect on the attitude toward the ad.

**Table 5: H5**

Regression summary table on attitude toward the ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>6.876</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 5 we are testing the influence of attitude toward the brand (IV) on attitude toward the ad (DV), by running a new linear regression. The results of this regression were positive, being brand attitude significant $b = 0.569$, $t = 6.876$, $p < 0.05$. The variable attitude toward the brand has a positive unstandardized coefficient. This means attitude toward the ad will increase, when the customer’s attitude toward the brand increases. Hence hypothesis number 5 is supported.

**Hypothesis 6:** Proneness to self-disclosure would have a positive effect on the willingness to share the ad.

**Table 6: H6**

Regression summary table on willingness to share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proneness to self-disclosure</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To verify hypothesis number 6, a linear regression is run, measuring the influence of customer’s proneness to self-disclosure (IV) on their willingness to share (DV). Table 6 shows how proneness to self-disclosure is significant in this model, $b = 0.232$, $t = 2.368$, $p < 0.05$. As expected, proneness to self-disclosure has a positive unstandardized coefficient, thus, it has a positive effect on customer’s willingness to share. Hence, the more proneness to self-disclosure a customer has, the more willingness to share the ad. Consequently, hypothesis number 6 is supported.
**Hypothesis 7:** The perceived attitude of friends/followers toward self-disclosure has a positive effect on willingness to share the ad and moderates the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad. The more positive f/f attitude toward self-disclosure is, the stronger the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad would be.

**Table 7: H7**

Regression summary table on willingness to share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proneness to self-disclosure</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/f attitude toward proneness to self-disclosure</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effect</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new linear regression was conducted to study the effects of customer’s proneness to self-disclosure (IV), friends/followers attitude toward proneness to self-disclosure and the interaction effect between the 2 variables on willingness to share the ad (DV). Table 7 presents the results of this analysis, where both independent variables as well as the interaction effect are non-significant. Therefore, hypothesis number 7 is not supported.

**Hypothesis 8:** Consumer’s attitude toward the ad would have a positive effect on the willingness to share.

**Table 8: H8**

Regression summary table on willingness to share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards the ad</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, our last hypothesis was tested using another linear regression, to verify the influence of customer’s attitude toward the ad (IV) on their willingness to share (DV) in this model. The results in table 8, show how attitude toward the ad is significant, \( b = 0.374, t = 4.013, p < 0.05 \). As expected, the attitude toward the ad has a positive unstandardized coefficient, so it has a positive
effect on customer’s willingness to share. Thus, the higher customer’s attitude toward the ad is, the higher willingness to share the ad. Hypothesis number 8, is therefore, supported by this model.

6. Discussion, limitations and future research

Table 9: hypothesis summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported/ not supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: For controversial products, informational advertising appeal would cause more positive attitude toward the ad, than sexual (emotional) advertising appeal</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: For controversial products, women would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with sophisticated personality, than a brand with rugged personality</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Gender would moderate the effect of brand personality on attitude towards the ad, so that men would have a more favourable attitude toward the ad for a brand with rugged personality, than a brand with sophisticated personality, but the reverse would hold for women</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Brand personality moderates the effect of brand equity on attitude towards the ad: the effect of brand equity would be stronger for brands with sophisticated personality, than for brands with rugged personality</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Attitude toward the brand would have a positive effect on the attitude toward the ad</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Proneness to self-disclosure would have a positive effect on the willingness to share the ad</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: The perceived attitude of friends/followers toward self-disclosure has a positive effect on willingness to share the ad and moderates the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad. The more positive f/f attitude toward self-disclosure is, the stronger the effect of self-disclosure proneness on willingness to share the ad would be</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Consumer’s attitude toward the ad would have a positive effect on the willingness to share</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case research we analyse the effect of advertising appeal on a customer’s willingness to share a viral advertisement, of a controversial product like underwear, on social media. This is performed by a survey experiment with random assignment to conditions, where besides other questions, respondents are asked if they would post a picture of them
wearing the advertiser’s promoted underwear, that was shown in the design experiment.

As Johan and Sirgy demonstrated in 1991, functional advertising appeals have a stronger effect on utilitarian products, while emotional appeals have higher effectiveness in value expressive products (Johar, 1991). The product chosen for this research study is underwear, considered as a banal everyday utilitarian object in the past, but currently seen as a well-recognised means of self-expression. Therefore, both an informational appeal and an emotional appeal are chosen for this study to measure the different results when appealing to consumer’s emotions versus their rational side. Unfortunately, there are no relevant past research studies on how a controversial product like underwear would influence customer’s willingness to share a user-generated content ad on social media. Our study did not find a significant effect of advertising appeal neither on attitude towards the ad, nor on willingness to share the ad. However, the lack of significant effect might be due to lack of statistical power: the sample size in our study is quite limited. Thus, more research regarding the advertising of underwear on social media platforms may be needed.

There is a second independent variable in this model: brand personality. This design experiment used two different brands: Victoria’s Secret and Nike; representing two different brand personalities: sophisticated and rugged. Based on the controversial nature of the product and the two different appeals that we want respondents to recall, these two notorious brands are picked in order to find the influence of brand personality on customer’s attitude toward the ad. There was no significant effect of the brand personality on attitude towards the ad and this was true for both men and women. Again, lack of statistical power could explain lack of significance. Alternatively, brand personality is not so important in attitude towards the ad of controversial products and other factors matter more. One of the limitations though is that only two of the five personality dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness) found by Aaker are used in this study (Aaker J. L., 1997). Therefore, there is space for other studies to find the influence of brand personality on customer’s attitude toward the ad, by using all five personal dimensions of Aaker within one model.
The present research study, has not found any concluding effects of the two main independent variables on the dependent one, not supporting hypotheses 1 and 2. This means that brand personality and advertising appeal have no influence on consumer’s attitude towards the ad in this model. Does this mean there is no actual effect between the independent variables and the dependent one? This could be the case, even though these were not the expected results. Based on past research and the fact that this study faces power issues, there is a need to proceed with further research, to shed more light on this particular topic.

The results of this model are significant for four hypotheses, presented in table 9. Hypothesis 4 showed that brand equity matters more for products with sophisticated personality compered to products with rugged personality in defining attitude toward the ad. This hypothesis was integrated in this study based on the clearly supported fact that customer’s brand past perceptions and associations matter for attitude toward the ad, but especially when the brand is seen as the one with the ambition of offering “extra value”.

Hypothesis 5 and hypothesis 8 were proven significant in numerous past studies, like Mitchell and Olson in 2000, explaining the influence of attitude toward the brand on attitude toward the ad, together with the influence of attitude toward the ad on consumers’ will (Mitchell, 2000). As mentioned before, there are no other research studies found, regarding viral advertising with user-generated content of a controversial product. Thus, the importance of the obtained results resides in confirming the significance of these relationships, combined this time, with a very different set of variables and using a distinct type of advertisement.

As explained throughout this study, nowadays millions of users publicly share personal information, and even intimate content on their social media platforms (Bazarova, 2014). Therefore, in this study, it is considered of great importance to proof the significant relationship between respondents’ proneness to self-disclosure and their willingness to share the ad publicly. These results could be translated, with the help of further researches, into marketers targeting audiences with higher levels of proneness to self-disclosure, for viral advertisements of user-generated content that could feel too intimate for some customers. Clearly this study opens gaps for further research on viral advertising through social media networks. Nevertheless, it is
important to consider what still remains as the main limitation of this study. As mentioned in the results section, low statistical power could be reflected on the significance of the results, and therefore another research study should confirm the significance of these effects.

Respondents’ past brand associations could also cause limitations in this study. These associations could bias respondents’ attitude toward the ad and so, their willingness to share the ad of this particular brand on social media. Also, the fact that Victoria’s Secret has, up until now, sold products only for the female sector, is another limitation that may have biased male responses about this brand.

Past studies have proven the importance of the advertising message (Ling, 2005). This study only looks at the influence of the independent variables, based on visual advertising together with an explanatory text and a 500 euros card incentive to push consumers’ motivation (Berger, 2014). Hence, it is suggested to run a new design experiment, with an implemented message that reinforces the effect of the visuals. Therefore, it would be useful for further investigation, to study how these two elements combined have an influence on willingness to share.
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Appendix

Survey

Start of Block: Introduction

This survey is part of my Master thesis at the Erasmus University of Rotterdam. It is anonymous and all information provided will be used for scientific purposes only. It will take you about 6 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. Please read carefully the following case and answer the questions related to it (supposing there are stores of the publishing firm in your city). Thank you very much for your time and support.

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Warm up

Q1 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q2 What is your age?

________________________

Q3 Do you consider yourself a religious person?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q4 Please, indicate which size of clothes you wear

- XS (1)
- S (2)
- M (3)
- L (4)
- XL (5)
- Skip question (6)

Q5 Do you have any social media account?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q6 How many times a month do you post/share content on it?

- Every day (1)
- About 2-3 times a week (2)
- A few times a month (3)
- A few times a year (4)
- Never (5)

End of Block: Warm up

Start of Block: Block 5

Victoria's Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Victoria's Secret sporty underwear, on one of our social media channels. We believe in a fair game, so if you don't own a pair of these amazingly comfortable underwear, then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don’t worry, if you still feel like
passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on any of your social media channels. Don't miss out on this special offer!
Nike is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Nike sporty underwear, on one of our social media channels. We believe in a fair game, so if you don't own a pair of these amazingly comfortable underwear, then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don't worry, if you still feel like passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on any of your social media channels. Don't miss out on this special offer!
Victoria's Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Victoria's Secret sexy underwear, on one of our social media channels. We believe in a fair game, so if you don’t own a pair of these amazingly appealing underwear, then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don’t worry, if you still feel like passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on one of your social media channels. Don’t miss out on this special offer!
Nike is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wearing the new Nike sexy underwear, on one of our social media channels. We believe in a fair game, so if you don’t own a pair of these amazingly appealing underwear, then come into our stores, where you will be greeted with a free set and a professional photographer to make sure you get your best shot. Oh, and don’t worry, if you still feel like passing on the opportunity to win the gift card, you can have your free set by easily sharing this ad on any of your social media channels. Don’t miss out on this special offer!
Q7 To what extent is Nike defined by the following personality traits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Not at all descriptive (1)</th>
<th>Slightly descriptive (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat descriptive (3)</th>
<th>Very descriptive (4)</th>
<th>Extremely descriptive (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness (Toughness)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display This Question:

If Victoria’s Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of... Is Displayed

Or Victoria’s Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of... Is Displayed

Q8 To what extent is Victoria’s Secret defined by the following personality traits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Not at all descriptive (1)</th>
<th>Slightly descriptive (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat descriptive (3)</th>
<th>Very descriptive (4)</th>
<th>Extremely descriptive (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness (Toughness)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Display This Question:

*If Victoria’s Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of... Is Displayed*

*Or Victoria’s Secret is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of... Is Displayed*

Q9 Given the following statements about underwear, to what extent do you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS would be my first choice (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not buy other brands if VS is available at the store (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likely quality of VS is extremely high (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likelihood that VS would be functional is very high (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognise VS among other competing brands (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of VS (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some characteristics of VS come to my mind quickly (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of VS (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Display This Question:**

**If Nike is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wea... Is Displayed**

**Or Nike is giving you the opportunity to win a 500€ gift card! Simply post a picture of yourself wea... Is Displayed**

Q10 Given the following statements about underwear, to what extent do you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nike would be my first choice (1)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not buy other brands if Nike is available at the store (2)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likely quality of Nike is extremely high (3)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likelihood that Nike would be functional is very high (4)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognise Nike among other competing brands (5)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of Nike (6)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some characteristics of Nike come to my mind quickly (7)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of Nike (8)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q11 Given the following attributes, what do you think about the brand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>Very Attractive</th>
<th>Very Desirable</th>
<th>Extremely Likable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unattractive</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Undesirable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q12 Given the following attributes, what do you think about the ad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (7)</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
<th>Not irritating</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritating</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 How likely would you be to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impossibl e (1)</th>
<th>Unlikel y (2)</th>
<th>Possibl e (3)</th>
<th>Even chance (4)</th>
<th>Probabl e (5)</th>
<th>Very likely (6)</th>
<th>Certain (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participate in the contest and post a picture of yourself in underwear? (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share the advertisement on social media? (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share information about the advertisement with the person/people you communicate next? (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page Break

Q14 Suppose you want to participate in this contest and post your picture, which social network would you use?

- Facebook (1)
- Instagram (2)
- Other (please specify) (3) ________________________________
- Twitter (4)
Q15 How many followers/friends do you have on it approximately? (Numeric answer)

_______________________________________________________________

Q16 Do you have a private or a public profile? (can anyone see your profile?)

○ Private (1)

○ Public (2)

Q17 Who do you have as followers/friends?

○ I have mostly close friends (1)

○ I have mostly people that I know in real life (2)

○ I have mostly people that I don’t know in real life (3)

Page Break

Q18 Given the following statement, how often do you..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Almost never (2)</th>
<th>Rarely (3)</th>
<th>Sometimes (4)</th>
<th>Often (5)</th>
<th>Usually (6)</th>
<th>Always (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posting pictures of myself on social media is something I do...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Q19 Given the following statements, to what extent do you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I share/post my emotions on social media... (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I share/post my thoughts on social media... (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share/post pictures of my body on social media... (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 Given the following statements, to what extent do you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think my friends/followers would not mind that I share pictures of myself on social media (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends/followers would approve that I share pictures of myself on social media (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q21 How do you evaluate the following attributes for the ideal underwear?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very plain looking (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low quality (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very expensive (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very uncomfortable (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 How do you evaluate the following attributes for the underwear advertised?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very plain looking (1)</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low quality (2)</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very expensive (3)</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very uncomfortable (4)</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very good looking

Very high quality

Very reasonable price

Very comfortable
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